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| 4 | 30-June-2016 | Revised based SPM feedback |
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**Overview of Appraisal:**

Customer Name: New York State Lottery

Batch Name: CY1604 ES Anywhere Batch

SAP ID: NY23598

Location: ATC

Go Live Date:

* BTC 1 - 6/6/2016
* BTC 2 - 6/22/16

**Project Stakeholders:**

Regional Lead: John Quigley

Program Manager: Damion Ferraro

Software Project Manager: Beki Mason-Corwin

Compliance Manager: Karen Robertson

Standards Compliance Lead: Luis Mario Cancino Garcia

**Scope:**

## The purpose of the CAPA report is to provide management with appropriate visibility into the processes being used by the software project(s) and of the products being built. This report will provide insight into any process improvements, trend analysis or other project issues that come up.  A Management response is required by the project for the findings listed below. A Corrective Action or Preventative Action will then be given based on the responses and the findings.

*Sample of required management response below:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Finding:** | **Detail:** |
| **Management Response:** |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**  *This will be completed by STC once management responses are completed* |

**Ratings:**

The method used in this CLASS C for determining and reporting practice characterizations and related goal risk is as follows.

* Each practice in appraisal scope will be given a Red, Yellow, and Green characterization defined in the following table using the SCAMPI A rules for NI, PI, LI and FI based on direct and/or in-direct artifacts without sufficiency, confirmation or collaborative rules enforced. Team judgment will determine characterization based primarily on the present artifact evidence with additional insight gained through interviews.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Label** | **Meaning** | **CLASS C Equivalent Characterization Type** |
| Red (Low) | The intent of the model practice is judged absent or inadequately addressed in the approach or implementation: goal achievement is judged unlikely because of this absence or inadequacy. | Not Implemented (NI) |
| Yellow (Medium) | The intent of the model practice is judged to be partially or largely addressed in approach or implementation, and only limited support for goal achievement is evident. | Partially Implemented (PI) or Largely Implemented (LI) |
| Green (High) | The intent of the model practice is judged to be adequately addressed in the set of practices (planned or deployed with implementation) in a manner that supports the achievement of the goal in the given process context or implementation. | or Fully Implemented (FI) |

**Summary of Findings/Weaknesses:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Planning | **Detail:**   * No evidence of internal (IGT) and external (customer) project scope approval |
| **Management Response:**   |  | | --- | | Project uses an approved/controlled Business plan and RFSS request form to define the Project Scope Statement. | |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**   * An approved tailoring request is required when using an alternative practice for defining/approving the project scope |
| Integrated Project Management | **Detail:**   * Project phases and practices do not fully reflect Waterfall SDLC requirements per project plan   **Note:**  **BTC 1**   * Design and Development overlap * Site Test and CAT are conducted in parallel   **BTC2**   * Design, Development and Integration are conducted in parallel * Site Test and CAT are conducted in parallel |
| **Management Response:**   |  | | --- | | Project will review its selection of the Waterfall software development lifecycle (SDLC) model and determine if another SDLC model better suits its practices. | |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**   * Std compliance reviewed Iterative SDLC model with the SPM. This model is more compatible to actual project practices and will be considered for use in subsequent batches. |
| Project Monitoring and Control | **Detail:**   * No evidence project conducted the milestone reviews listed below for each planned BTC (1/2) * Initial/Beginning of Development * Release to Integration * Release to Production * Go-live |
| **Management Response:**   |  | | --- | | NY project management will determine which type of milestone reviews better suit its practices. | |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**   * This finding is related to the incompatible software development lifecycle model; see project planning finding listed above for more details. |
| Verification | **Detail:**   * No evidence the code review results for the ESTE critical code were submitted to the PRMS * No evidence of SRS peer review results in the PRMS |
| **Management Response:**   |  | | --- | | Project conducted peer reviews and code reviews but did not capture defect data for submittal to PRMS | |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**   * Compliance reviewed peer review and code review process requirements with project management * Finding will be included in the subsequent projects preventive action report |
| Requirements Management | **Detail:**   * No evidence customer approved of Go-Live date changes   **Note:**   * CR-1 Go-live change * CR-4 Go-live change |
| **Management Response:**   |  | | --- | | ADM acts on behalf of the customer and has approved of Go-Live date changes | |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**  Project must submit a tailoring request to deviate from this process requirement and provide evidence ADM and customer have agreed to this directive.  This tailoring request should be done at the program/customer level to ensure it is applicable to all New York batches. |
| Requirements Management | **Detail:**   * No evidence customer approved of scope changes * CR 3 - NYL request this enhancement be added * CR 5 - NYL requested the Selling Retailer Number…. * CR 6 - Add NYSA-4568 ESA - Revised Paymaxs Messaging   **Note:** project attains Senior Site Operations Manager approval |
| **Management Response:**   |  | | --- | | ADM acts on behalf of the customer and has approved scope changes | |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**   * Project must submit a tailoring request to deviate from this process requirement and provide evidence ADM and customer have agreed to this directive. * This tailoring request should be done at the program/customer level to ensure it is applicable to all New York batches. |
| Technical Solution | **Detail:**   * Release Notes for ESRS, ESTE, and ES IPS Host are missing information   See Summary 2 for details. |
| **Management Response:**   |  | | --- | | Team briefed on the importance of completing all RN fields. | |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**   * This finding will be monitored in subsequent batches. |
| Technical Solutions | **Detail:**   * No evidence Release Notes were approved by the Director of Operations/Quality Assurance in accordance with Section 12 Gtech Approvals |
| **Management Response:**   |  | | --- | | * Project removed Director of Operations/Quality Assurance approval requirements * RN approval will be done by CCB members | |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**   * This finding will be monitored in subsequent batches. |
| **Observation**  SAM | **Observation**  Project should incorporate IDM and CMMI SAM requirements when interacting with third party vendors.   * NDA * Quality requirements (e.g., CM, Monitor Deliverables, Schedules, Acceptance Testing criteria) |
| **Observation**  Project Planning | **Observation**  Program should consider establishing a program level software development plan to manage batch planning instead of establishing a plan for each batch.  New York batches are all managed by the same team and adhere to the same program requirements defined in the SDP. |
| **Observation**  Integrated Project Management | **Observation**   * No evidence project tailored process to account for alternative processes |

**Detail of Findings:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PA | SG | SP | Description | Rating |
| PP | 1 | 1.1 | No evidence of internal (IGT) and external (customer) project scope approval | LI |
| IPM | 1 | 1.1 | * Project practices do not fully reflect Waterfall SDLC requirements per project plan * No evidence of approved tailoring to account for deviations | LI |
| PMC | 1 | 1.7 | No evidence project conducted the milestone reviews listed below for BTC 1 and 2   * Initial/Beginning of Development * Release to Integration * Release to Production * Go-live | LI |
| VER | 2 | 2.3 | * Code review results for the ESTE critical code were not submitted to the PRMS * No evidence of SRS peer review results in the PRMS | LI |
| REQM | 1 | 1.3 | No evidence customer approved of Go-Live date changes | LI |
| REQM | 1 | 1.3 | No evidence customer approved of scope changes | LI |
| TS | 3 | 3.1 | Release Notes for ESRS, ESTE, and ES IPS Host are missing information | LI |
| TS | 3 | 3.1 | No evidence RNs were approved by the Director of Operations/Quality Assurance in accordance with Section 12 Gtech Approvals | LI |
| SAM | Obv | Obv | Project should incorporate IDM and CMMI SAM requirements when interacting with 3rd party vendors. | Obv |
| PP | Obv | Obv | Program should consider establishing a program level software development plan to manage batch planning instead of establishing a plan for each batch. | Obv |
| IPM | Obv | Obv | No evidence project tailored process to account for alternative processes | Obv |

**Appendix**

**CMMI Process Areas and Definitions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Process Area** | **Definition** |
| Requirements Development (RD) | RD emphasizes the establishment of customer, product and product component requirements. |
| Requirements Management (REQM) | REQM adds the management of requirements to provide a well-controlled foundation on which the product is built. |
| Project Planning (PP) | PP aids project managers in planning project activities |
| Project Monitoring and Control (PMC) | PMC emphasizes managing project performance according to the plan. |
| Risk Management (RSKM) | RSKM enables projects to proactively identify and reduce risks that may jeopardize achieving project objectives. |
| Configuration Management (CM) | CM emphasizes configuration management and change control processes for designated work products. |
| Process and Product Quality Assurance (PPQA) | PPQA evaluates the quality of processes and work products. |
| Measurement and Analysis (MA) | MA addresses the information needs of the organization and projects with a measurement system. |
| Decision Analysis and Resolution (DAR) | DAR supports making major decisions using a formal decision process. |
| Technical Solution (TS) | TS focuses on designing and building the solutions. |
| Product Integration (PI) | PI addresses integrating the solutions and delivering the products. |
| Verification (VER) | VER emphasizes ensuring the solutions satisfy the requirements. |
| Validation (VAL) | VAL emphasizes ensuring the solutions satisfy the need. |

## Definitions, Acronyms and Abbreviations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * BI – Business Intelligence * CML – Configuration Management Lead * CR – Change Request * PRR – Product Release Request * RDL – Regional Lead * SDD – Software Design Description * SRS – Software Requirements Specification | * CA – Corrective Action * PA – Preventative Action * LI - Largely Implemented * PI - Partially Implemented * NI – Not Implemented * OBV - Observation |